

# Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Vol. V, No. 14

August 6, 1945

PUBLIC LIBRARY  
\$1.50 per year, 10 cents per copy  
AUG 4 1945  
DETROIT

## The Charter

IT is difficult for a world that has been taught for some years by bitter experience to expect the worst, to do justice to the achievements of the San Francisco Conference. The conference itself, in spite of the various "crises" that received so much publicity and in spite of such questionable episodes as the admission of Argentina, was a most heartening experience. It proved to be a forum in which the smaller powers were able to put the great powers on the spot, in which voices carried far even though they were not backed by military might—the voice of Mr. Evatts of Australia, for example. Toward the end, after the major conflicts had been settled, there developed a remarkable spirit of fellowship among the delegates, and even though there were periods of serious tension there was more mutual trust at the end than at the beginning. Feelings such as these may come and go, but that they were possible at all under such conditions augurs well for the future.

The Charter, it is generally agreed, is much more liberal and humane than Dumbarton Oaks. Mr. Dulles goes so far as to say: "The Charter that emerges from San Francisco is a totally different instrument from the draft of Dumbarton Oaks." The churches are so interpreting it, and are claiming that most of the amendments proposed by the Cleveland Conference were embodied in the final Charter.

It should be admitted that the advances that were made at San Francisco do not alter the structure of power in the world. But no charter could alter that. Power is based upon population, economic resources and military potential and not on constitutions. If there was a danger that the great nations might abuse their power under Dumbarton Oaks, that danger remains much the same under San Francisco. But we should ask the following questions concerning the San Francisco Charter:

*Does it point the way to the goals of law, justice, freedom and social welfare which are the real conditions of peace?*

The Charter is here very much stronger than any of us expected it to be. The Economic and Social Council has been given great importance. The development of international law has been stimulated.

The Commission for the Promotion of Human Rights is expected to aid the cause of religious and civil liberty. The announced goal of the Trusteeship Council is to fit all peoples for self-government or independence. None of these high objectives is guaranteed. In the nature of the case they cannot be guaranteed. All will depend on the real purposes of the participating nations and particularly of the great powers.

*Does it create a framework in which it is natural for the power of the great nations to be used cooperatively?*

There can be no doubt that it does this. If nothing more is accomplished, the three most powerful nations are held together. Instruments for their continuing cooperation have been provided. Constant consultations on many levels and not occasional dramatic meetings of heads of states will be the rule. The world contains innumerable specific issues that may divide them and what happens in the day by day decisions in central Europe may be as important as what happens at the seat of the United Nations. The legacy of the war in Europe and the continuing horror in the Pacific are unfavorable backgrounds for world order, but the institutions of San Francisco and the desperate necessities of even the strongest nations are on the side of cooperation. Without this cooperation no other values are possible.

*Does it begin the process by which power is gradually shared?*

The fact that it does this is in the long run the chief ground for hope. It is not unimportant that from the start, as far as constitutional arrangements are concerned, the effective power of three nations is shared with two other nations, on a basis of equality. Then, six selected nations share much of the authority that is exercised by the Security Council and these will be under the scrutiny of all the nations by which they are chosen. The Assembly will be the kind of world forum that we saw at work in the San Francisco Conference itself, and it will have power to elect the six non-permanent members of the Security Council as well as the members of such agencies as the Economic and Social Council on which the smaller powers will be effectively represented. The veto

of the permanent members of the Security Council is at this stage a necessary recognition of the actual responsibility that goes with their power, but the fact that in cases to which any one of them is a party this veto is abandoned, up to the point where a judgment is delivered, is at least a foreshadowing of the abridgment of sovereignty. It is an acceptance of the principle that no nation should be judge in its own cause.

J. C. B.

## Editorial Notes

The "Statement on Our Policy Toward Japan," signed by all members of the Editorial Board of CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS who could be reached and published in our issue of June 25th, has evoked a considerable comment in both the secular and the religious press, as well as an extensive correspondence. We print below a representative selection from this correspondence.

The Statement raised two issues: the unwisdom of reiterating an insistence upon the "unconditional surrender" of Japan without definition of the terms for post-war Japan which might encourage such a surrender, and the justification of obliteration bombing of Japanese cities and civilians merely on grounds of military expediency and without regard to long-range effect upon American-Japanese relations.

The first issue is being pressed from many diverse angles and by persons and groups of the widest knowledge and wisdom. Under the heading "Ideas Can Fight Japan," Mr. Hanson Baldwin, military analyst of the "New York Times," has summarized an irrefutable case: "Japan is seeking a way out of the holocaust of flame and death to which her own policies have brought her. . . . Bombs and bullets must be supplemented by a clear and positive statement of our own—and Allied—aims in the Orient, a program of 'do's,' as well as 'don'ts.' Unconditional surrender is not enough." So weighty a consensus of protest against our present policy, arising without collusion from many sources, suggests a wholesome reassertion of the American public's right of judgment and criticism of leadership. It should be pressed until action, or a convincing official rejoinder, is forthcoming.

On the second point, there is less discussion and a less sensitive public conscience. But, from the Christian perspective, and possibly from the political perspective, this is the more fundamental issue. It is the issue whether military policy should be controlled solely by immediate military results, in disregard of both humanitarian and ultimate political considerations. So long as the outcome of the War was in any sense uncertain, unquestioning submission to

military judgment might be justified. That time has definitely passed. The time has come when military decisions should be brought under rigorous moral scrutiny and within the context of far-visioned political policy. If we are to enter a post-war era when power is to be the principal arbiter of world destiny, the forcing of this issue by the Christian public is a matter of highest importance.

H. P. V. D.

## Our Policy Toward Japan

### Communications from Our Readers:

The statement by your editors in the July 25th issue on the bombing, and on terms for Japan expresses my own views. We have every right to raise questions about the circumstances under which human beings are killed; in fact, it is our duty to do so.

In respect to the terms for Japan, we ought to raise that question persistently. If there is an issue among the best informed between minimal and maximal terms for Japan, we ought to case our influence in favor of the minimal terms. Maximal terms imply that we know more than we do know, and that we have a larger control of the future than we actually possess.

May I venture to suggest that we ought not to gloss over the differences between your approach to these problems and the pacifist approach. If we are really to help the church find its way in dealing with these issues, one of our main jobs is to set up standards by which the Christian participant in politics is to distinguish between the better and the worse. To equate our position with the position of those who, from the beginning, have disclaimed all participation in the war and any moral sanction for it, only leads to confusion.

JUSTIN WROE NIXON.

May I heartily endorse your recent expression of opinion on the Japanese war and congratulate you for your integrity and courage.

The conclusions you have reached are, in my opinion, the only ones humanity and Christianity, to say nothing of sanity, can tolerate and how they have needed expression!

Fortunately your pronouncement will carry special weight because of your admirable anti-pacifist record.

In the earnest hope that you will carry on your good work, for the world, for the future of Christianity, and for the thousands of helpless American boys and innocent Japanese who stand at this abyss, I beg to remain,

FLORENCE JACOBS.

A chaplain in the Pacific writes us as follows:

"This letter is prompted by a short reference in a recent issue of *Time* to an article in CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS questioning whether the present policy of destruction of Japanese cities by bombing does not exceed the demands of military necessity. Of course I have not seen the original article yet since *Time* gets here air mail, but I do wish to thank you for voicing this feeling which I am sure is in the hearts of many Christians. It might be well to investigate whether there has not been a deliberate trapping of civilian people by the pattern in which incendiary bombs were dropped, so as to augment the loss of life. I know that policies like these are arousing questions in the minds of some of the men, at least, that have to carry them out.

"I believe that we have a clear cut moral duty to define 'unconditional surrender.' If we don't our pride may cost countless lives on both sides."

A distinguished American author and critic also supports the statement in the following words:

"The coming of CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS today reminds me that I had wanted to write you after reading your declaration about obliteration bombing in the last issue: what you said there I have felt for a long while and would have expressed in public if I

could have found the right time and place for saying it. We have taken over the totalitarian theory of warfare without any critical examination; without even perceiving that its immorality may also, from our point of view, be inefficiency. Even from a strictly military standpoint air power has been over-rated, just because it has been over-publicized: thousands of lives were lost, precious weeks and months were wasted, because our army, being under the delusion that airpower would achieve the knock-out blow, never provided enough heavy artillery and never ordered a sufficient number of shells to do the work: they relied upon the air forces, at the mercy of the weather, to do what only artillery could accomplish. In 1942, when I spent a week in Washington, the question of whether air power could be used to subdue Japan, without heinous *moral offense*, was still being debated in the inner circles. The air arm won that argument, apparently; and we are going ahead on those lines without worrying what will happen when we try to pacify and govern a country whose organs of political and social life have been annihilated. Your declaration should be followed up; I think you would get many laymen with no religious affiliation to join with you, as I for one would not have joined with the more pacifist statement of the other group, even though I approved their purpose."

## Russia's Religious Situation

GEORGE P. FEDOTOV

THREE years ago (April 6, 1942) I tried to disentangle, for the readers of CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS, the very obscure and complicated riddle of the present plight of the Russian Church. That time was the honeymoon of the new Soviet Church reconciliation. The persecution of the Church, as well as anti-religious propaganda had stopped since the outbreak of the great "national" War. The Church was permitted to pray publicly, even in the Kremlin itself, for the victory of the Red Army. The State accepted, benevolently and encouragingly the new helper in the terrific struggle for Russia's existence—was it a real dawn of religious freedom in Russia?

My analysis of Russia's religious forces led me to a not too comforting prospect. Seeing in Metropolitan Sergius the representative of religious survival (as opposed to a true revival), I came to the conclusion: "Hence the danger of cooperation between these two men, Stalin and Sergius, which would mean the possibility of the establishment of a new political Byzantinism in Russia."

Since these lines were written, full cooperation between Stalin and Sergius, and now Stalin and Alexius (the present Patriarch) has been going on

without interruption or reaction. The moving tendencies of this development which could be only guessed three years ago now lie bared, with sufficient clarity, before our eyes. Byzantinism, of course, is out of the question for our generation, but, on the whole, my expectations are, unfortunately, confirmed by a series of recent events. They disclose what the new situation means for the Russian Church:

Let us consider, first, the gains of the new order for the Church which are unquestionable. Not one of the severe restrictive decrees curbing religion has been abolished but, at least, freedom of cult in a narrow sense, guaranteed by the constitution, is now secured. People are not afraid to go to Church, even those of higher rank in the Army. Priests are no longer, it seems, imprisoned or deported for no other guilt than their popularity or excess of religious zeal. Churches are not forcibly closed by the government; they are even re-opened.

Then there is a promise of freedom for the religious press and ecclesiastical schools. Actually, since the opening of the new era, two books have been published and one periodical having connection with the Church, if not with religion. These books are official publications entitled: "The Truth on Re-



ligion in Russia," (1942) and "The Russian Orthodox Church and the War" (1943). Richly edited and illustrated, in spite of the war time scarcity of paper, these books are purely propaganda—collections of declarations, decrees and sermons by bishops and priests trying to affirm the freedom of religion in Russia and the unity of Church, State and people in the national defense. The periodical is "The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate," an official chronicle of ecclesiastical events and canonical acts of the Church administration. In all these publications, articles of purely religious content—apologetical, theological or even ethical are almost absent. In Moscow a theological seminary is to be opened for the preparation of future priests; some other schools of minor importance have been planned or started in provincial towns. It is characteristic, however, that the Government has removed from their program all subjects of general, not merely professional, interest—philosophy, history and the like.

The meaning is clear. The priest must exercise no intellectual influence on society, must stand helpless before the spokesman of "Modern Science." His functions are purely sacramental. A carry-over from a pre-revolutionary era, he is there to satisfy the needs of other survivals condemned ultimately to disappear. The (nominal) President of USSR, Mr. Kalinin, confirmed (in 1943) the fact that nothing has been changed in the basic attitude of the State toward religion: "We believe that religion is a misleading institution, and struggle against it by education. But since religion still grips considerable sections of the population and some people are deeply religious, we cannot combat it by ridicule."

It would seem, therefore, that the "New Religious Policy" (NRP) means nothing else but freedom of cult, proclaimed in the Constitution of USSR but never before truly realized. Such freedom, limited as it is, should be welcomed by all friends of the Russian Church and people. Unfortunately, the significance of the change is more far-reaching. Having secured its freedom of cult, the Church by no means limits its activity to the cult alone. Prohibited from carrying the word of God to unchristian society, the Church sees itself engaged on the political road in the service of the Soviet State. Even limited liturgical freedom had to be bought at a high price.

There is no reason to doubt the patriotism of the Russian clergy and their willingness to cooperate with the nation in a common defense. But this cooperation, as in the Czarist times, seems to ignore any frontiers between God's and Caesar's kingdoms.

Not only has the Church called the people to resistance, to Guerilla War—which can be justified—but it has engaged in canonical condemnations of traitors, of collaborationists, of separatists in the Ukraine and the Baltic states. Official documents of Metropolitan Sergius reveal that in all occupied

provinces of USSR, the Germans organized the Orthodox Church under Bishops who changed their loyalties. This unquestionable political treason was judged and condemned by Sergius on canonical grounds. He also did not feel it beyond his competence to blame the Allies for procrastination with respect to the "second front." Not only the mother country, but also its dictator is praised and glorified beyond all measure. Yesterday's persecutor of the Church, Stalin, is now styled "God Chosen Leader" of Russia.

Patriotism is a good thing. Yet, reading over letters and sermons of Russian Metropolitans, we are shocked by the exaggeration of its expression. Throughout the official books, the Church is always spoken of as the Russian Church, or the Church of the Russian nation; practically never, as The Church of Christ. Nowhere, accordingly, is any attempt made to ethicize or educate in a Christian sense the natural patriotism of the nation. The preaching of hatred, upon the masses by agents of the state, is freely and easily accepted and carried on by the hierarchs. "The true patriot's arm will not trouble in destroying Fascist invaders. The heart of a Christian is closed to Fascist beasts; it distills only annihilating deadly hatred toward the foe." This was written by a group of Russian Bishops, headed by Metropolitan Sergius, in November 1941.

At the end of 1943 the victorious Soviet armies were approaching Russia's frontiers. The defense of the Mother Country was no more an up-to-date slogan. International tasks of immense scope opened before the Soviet State and its armies. It was just the chosen moment for a new rearrangement of the relations between Church and State. On September 7th Stalin invited, for the first time, three of the leaders of the Russian Church to an intimate conversation of which the only item disclosed was—the Church was to be allowed to elect a Patriarch. It would be more exact to say—the Metropolitan Sergius, the *locum tenens* of the Patriarch, (since the death of Patriarch Tychon in 1924, new elections had been prohibited) was allowed to change his title. He was proclaimed Patriarch a week later by a small gathering of bishops. Contrary to tradition, no other candidates were nominated. The same procedure was applied, after the death of Sergius, at the "election" of his successor (January, 1945). This time a large body of bishops convened with the participation of some foreign Orthodox prelates. Undenially, this time it was a "National Council." In spite of the solemn ritual of the proceedings, the only candidate, Alexius, was nominated by a layman and communist, Mr. Karpov, Government representative.

For the welfare of the Russian Church, poor and only tolerated, the gorgeous title of its head has little importance. Much more important is the international role proposed to it. By the number of the

faithful and by the political weight of USSR, the Patriarch of Moscow becomes the central leader of the Orthodox World and an imposing figure for other Churches of Christendom. Indeed, vigorous activity in the ecclesiastic diplomatic field followed the creation of the new patriarch.

These international political activities of the Church, so far, fall along three lines. The first and the most important is directed toward the consolidation of the Eastern Orthodox Nations around Moscow. In the Balkans three Orthodox nations, Rumania, Serbia and Bulgaria, divided by deep national hatreds, are united in religion. All of them now, allies and enemies alike, are in the Soviet zone of "influence." The Russian Church does that part of the work of unification which is beyond the influence of the Red Army and NKVD (GPU). Small Orthodox Churches scattered within the Arab states of the Middle East belong to the British sphere of influence, but are not exempt from revolutionary, anti-British propaganda carried from Moscow. Many local patriarchs of these countries took part in the last council at Moscow (1945) in the election of the new Russian Patriarch, Alexius, who has recently paid return visits to them. The journey of a Patriarch outside Russia has no precedent in history and, considering all the enormous difficulties for Soviet citizens to get exit visas, the political significance of these courtesy visits is beyond doubt.

The second political front of the Russian Church is anti-Roman. The Christian world was puzzled by the unexpected theological statement by Sergius of Moscow against the primacy of Rome. As the Roman Church has practically no parishes in USSR at present and no danger is menacing Russian Orthodoxy from this direction, the explanation must be sought in the continual polemic of the Soviet press against the Vatican. The main subject of quarrel is, of course, Poland.

The third field is the Protestant world of Anglo-Saxon countries. What is required here is to stress the freedom of the Russian Church and its basic unity with the Soviet Government, gaining for the latter the support of influential circles among liberal-minded ministers.

A particular, although minor, task is presented by the situation in the United States. Here exist numerous Orthodox parishes among American citizens of Russian origin. In 1933, they proclaimed their canonical autonomy under their own elected Metropolitan (now Theofilus). This autonomy was not recognized by Sergius of Moscow who suspended the Russian-American clergy and sent to the United States, as his representative, the Metropolitan Benjamin. The result is a schism. Only a few parishes follow Benjamin, but all regret enforced separation from the "Mother Church" and long for reconciliation. The Patriarchate of Moscow offers

political conditions for the reunion. Since 1928 it has been a declaration of "loyalty" towards the Soviet Government on the part of the clergy. At the last council of Moscow (1945) the loyalty was tempered down to "the giving up of anti-Soviet propaganda,"—a condition declined, nevertheless, by the Russian bishops of the United States as contrary to the freedom of American citizens. Meanwhile, the Metropolitan Benjamin, whose influence has increased during the war, has been developing great political activities in public speeches (he is a good orator) and articles in the "Daily Worker." Apology for the Soviet Government, with particular emphasis on the justification of terror, is the main feature of this propaganda. Metropolitan Benjamin enjoys a high regard in the USSR and he played a major part at the Council of 1945.

Thus, internal and external, the Patriarchate of Moscow serves the Soviet State, supporting it wholeheartedly in war and peace, in defense and aggression, seeing in this collaboration a national duty and, obviously, sharing an age-long Byzantine-Muscovite conviction that serving the National State is the best way of serving the Kingdom of God.

The reasons for the collaboration of Church and States in USSR are clear. Let us now consider more closely both partners to the transaction in the hope of disclosing, if possible, what is behind the diplomatic surface in the minds of the two, yesterday hostile and now allied, parties.

The Bolshevik State has long lost the ideological pattern of Leninism (Marxism). About ten or eleven years ago, it began to develop national and even nationalistic tendencies. Communism is considered as the product of Russian history, as a precious fruit of national tradition. This tradition was duly embodied in a double line of revolutionists and autocrats, with exclusion of liberals and everything savoring of freedom. National Communism (parallel to National Socialism) is a kind of Fascism, yet lacking doctrinal unity. The combination, Marx-Alexander Nevsky, is monstrous; but it permits the revision of the Communist attitude to religion. The Orthodox Church as a builder of the Russian State, as a protagonist of Czarist autocracy—all that made it loathsome in the years of the revolution—is now welcomed and justified. In historical novels, ancient Russian Saints (St. Sergius) are treated with great respect as political agents of Muscovite princes. This useful historical role, at the service of despotism, can be assumed again by the modern Church under a new totalitarian state.

On the other hand, all active elements of this state—the new Soviet intelligentsia, party leaders, Army officers, etc.—were brought up, and very successfully in atheism. Soviet Russians who are met abroad, hundreds of students or sailors in America, thousands of war prisoners in Europe, reveal very

little religious loyalty. Most of them frankly proclaim themselves atheists, although pretending—a new directive—to have no feelings of contempt toward the religious convictions of other people.

Under these conditions it would be absurd for Stalin to transfer the political basis of his power over the Church. As ensues from the words of Kalinin, cited above, Stalin has not come to Napoleon's view that Nations cannot be ruled without religion. Even if he came to this conviction, he would face an enormous task of re-educating masses in religious creeds. There is little chance of the re-establishment of the State Church in Russia after Napoleon's pattern—at least, for the time being.

Lenin, a clever cynic, used to say: "In a household, every small cord will be of use." The Church is of use for one, not a very influential, section of Russian society: old men, women, people in remote corners, far off from the radiation of "Soviet Culture." As abroad, Soviet propaganda tries to work on both revolutionary and reactionary circles (commercial prospects for business men, the support of nationalist passions), so in Russia itself atheists ("educated" classes) and believers (simple folk) require different treatment.

If the State's reasons for the New Religious Policy are perfectly clear, the readiness of the Church to take upon itself new political service, and its appalling zeal in the new role, are still to be interpreted.

After the revolution and under the regime of terror, the sincere longing of the churchmen in Russia was for freedom—to be free, once for all, from the State and all political dependence, on reaction and revolution alike. A free Church in a free State was the wish of the best.

For more than two decades, particularly since Sergius came to leadership (1928), the GPU did an effective work of purge or negative selection within the Church. All pure, courageous, independent leaders of the clergy, one after another, year after year, were removed, imprisoned, exiled, often shot. The weakest survived. It was the process of the "eradication of the best," to use the term of an eminent historian (O. Seeck) who thus explained the decadence of the Roman Empire. It is very characteristic of the new leadership of the Church that all big names in it—Sergius, Alexius, Benjamin—belong to the Episcopate of Czarist times, and that of the rightist orientation (Benjamin, of the extreme right). For them subservience to the absolute state is normal behavior.

This behavior is justified in their eyes by two religious, or pseudo-religious, considerations. First, the primacy of the cult and sacrament above all kinds of missionary, apologetical or social activities of the Church. Even in the Byzantine tradition, liturgy occupied an overwhelming place. So far as the cult was continuing, Sergius and his like were

convinced that all was right with the Church. They could accept wholeheartedly the limitations enforced upon the Church by the Communist State—Sacrament without Word.

Finally, with the war, came the second temptation—that of religious nationalism. This also is age-old. Conservative churchmen in Russia simply could not distinguish the destiny of the Russian nation from that of the Orthodox (in principle, oecumenical) Church. Every service to the Russian State was and is for them identical with service to the Church. Even if the State is now officially godless it is credited with expectations of future conversion. USSR may play an anti-Christian part in the world; for the Sergianists, it remains a face, temporarily masked, of Holy Russia.

For those who cannot accept this dark picture of present day Russian Christianity, I must emphasize what I wrote three years ago. The official Sergian Church does not represent the whole of the religious forces in Russia, even in the Orthodox Church. Thousands of priests and scores of bishops in terrible forced labor camps are still waiting for amnesty. Their faithful followers, in relative freedom, sometimes prefer to take sacraments from the secret wandering priests now persecuted both by the State and the official Church. Among those who go to Sergian Churches to pray ardently and to weep before the icons of Our Lady, most care little, as they cared little in the past, about what their bishops and priests say or write. The Church speaks for them with the tongue of eternity. There still exist open, unhealed schisms in the Orthodox Church. There are numerous old-believers, Orthodox in faith and cult, who have been separated from the established Church since the seventeenth century. There are sects of mystical and evangelical trends, old and new, of whose life we have but scanty information. The religious soul of Russia is still alive in now shrunken and split ecclesiastical bodies and one cannot predict from what side the true revival will come.

## Communications

Comments from a personal letter of a member of the Medical Corps, to his family:

"Speaking, carefully, to one boy in our ward that sleeps near me, I heard again, as before under various circumstances, of the unpublished, unspoken-of 'atrocities' (so called) carried on through pagan and vengeful means against German soldiers. His commanding officer was delighted to find that some of the prisoners were shot, in a long list of shameful (Nazi) kind of incidents. His unit guarded prisoners for a number of months in France. Most of the men in his unit welcomed any pretense to shoot and kill these prisoners. At one time the guard purposely walked out of sight, tempting some of the working Germans to start running. A machine gun was placed, with its sanguinary American crew, in some nearby bushes, just hoping, waiting



to have their 'sport.' The Germans didn't try to run, however. We have heard stories, true ones, where German civilians and soldiers had killed pilots who had bailed out of crippled American planes. Many Germans have now been convicted and killed for their crimes against the American pilots. However here is something for the other side of the ledger, if I may be so cold as to use a ledger in matters of human life. This same man's unit usually had the job of finding and guarding the German pilots that were shot down in the vicinity. According to our American friend, few if any were ever brought back to the Prisoner of War Cage. When they found these German pilots they immediately shot and killed them.

"... It goes on—where a German soldier was digging

a grave for the dead (this was a job detail for the German P.W.'s). One of the members of this unit said he looked like a German that had killed his buddy—so while the German was in the grave he was shot and killed by this American G.I. I won't go on, they are all the same and worse. It is interesting to note also that I have found many of the boys speaking of men in their units that were 'exhilarated' and 'enjoyed' or 'got a kick out of' gunning and killing men.

"The above is no exaggeration, I assure you, and represents just the casual discovery that I found thrown in my face, in just one place. War itself is an atrocity and all of its stenching attachments—no matter who is the 'player.' We *all* must repent and gain a newer, stronger faith in the honest-to-goodness living of Christ."

## The World Church: News and Notes

(In connection with the article in this number on "Russia's Religious Situation," we print a selection of news items of the past fortnight bearing upon the issues discussed in that article.)

### Bulgarian Orthodox Church Adopts Reforms

The Bulgarian Church has been renamed the Bulgarian Patriarchal Church and its head will hold the title of Patriarch instead of Exarch, as formerly. These moves were announced in a Sofia Radio broadcast reported by the Federal Communications Commission as part of far-reaching reforms which have been adopted by the Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, and which will be submitted to the Bulgarian government for approval.

The Sofia Radio quoted Exarch Stefan as stating that the book of church statutes now under consideration "aims at making the church more democratic" and that this policy will be aided by the "congregational status" of the Bulgarian Church.

"This status," the Exarch explained, "gives opportunity for actual democratic government without violating the unchanging principles of Scriptures and without violating accepted church canons."

A supreme council of parish priests and laymen, elected at a church people's congress, will be established. The Exarch said that a general church economic co-operative bank also will be established in which church capital will be invested and come under definite control. In addition, plans are being made for a church economic cooperative for monasteries and real estate. (RNS)

### Russian Orthodox Delegation to Visit U. S.

Archbishop Alexei of Yaroslavl and Rostov will leave Moscow shortly for the United States as head of an official delegation of the Russian Orthodox Church. American visas have been issued for the Archbishop and his party, but the exact date of their departure has not been announced.

First high-ranking prelate from Russia to visit the United States since the Revolution, Archbishop Alexei is expected to confer with leaders of the Russian Ortho-

dox Church in America in an attempt to bring about a reconciliation of dissident elements, headed by Metropolitan Theophilus of San Francisco, which have refused to recognize the authority of the Moscow Patriarchate.

Archbishop Alexei had been scheduled to preside at a general council of the Russian Orthodox Church in America at which a new Metropolitan is to be elected in place of Metropolitan Theophilus. (RNS)

### Moscow Church Journal Assails Vatican

Two articles criticizing "political activities" of the Roman Catholic Church are features in the latest issue of the *Journal* of the Moscow Patriarchate, official organ of the Russian Orthodox Church. The articles are by Metropolitan Benjamin, Patriarchal Exarch of the Aleutian Islands and North America, and Bishop Nikolai of Volyn and Rovno, who also attacks Vatican proselytizing efforts among the Orthodox in Slav countries. Other articles deal mainly with internal affairs of the Russian Church. (RNS)

### Announce End of Estonian Orthodox Schism

The so-called Estonian schism which arose after the Russian Orthodox Church in Estonia was granted autonomy in 1941 has been ended, according to the *Journal* of the Moscow Patriarchate. Under terms of reconciliation, the Synod of the Estonian Church will be liquidated and an Estonian Diocesan Council established, headed by an archbishop and consisting of two Russians and two Estonian members. (RNS)

### Armenian Orthodox Denounce Vatican "Ambitions"

Charges that Vatican "Ambitions" are hindering "the lofty aims of Christianity" were made in a statement issued by the general council of the Armenian Gregorian Orthodox Church at the conclusion of its recent sessions. The statement was signed by newly-elected Catholicos Georg VI, and other leaders of the Church.

Declaring that the Christian churches are called upon

# Christianity and Crisis

*A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion*

601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

GLOSTER MORRIS, *Secretary of Editorial Board*

to play an extraordinary role in promoting ideals of "brotherhood, justice, and liberty" throughout the world, the statement added:

"Politically directed activities on the part of Christian churches can only serve as a barrier to these aims. They prepare the groundwork for a new and terrible war that may cause the destruction of millions of people and of the creative culture of mankind and bring incalculable disaster to mankind."

(RNS)

## Moscow Seminary to Enroll 200 Students

More than 200 students are expected to be enrolled when the Russian Orthodox Theological Academy opens its Fall sessions, it has been announced by the *Journal* of the Moscow Patriarchate. A full course will require four years of study, but students who aspire only to the lower ranks of the clergy may qualify after two years at the academy.

(RNS)

## Pope Upholds Minority Rights

Receiving Herbert H. Lehman, Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and a party of his officials, Pope Pius XII spoke out strongly for liberty of national minorities and against dictatorship by the State.

The Pontiff sounded a call to the democracies to ensure that suffering war victims, being helped with material goods, also enjoy the democracies' immaterial benefits.

"Has man certain God-given rights which States are obliged to protect and may not infringe upon?" he asked. "Or is the notion to prevail which assigns unlimited power to the State, leaving to the individual only what

rights and prerogatives the State may find it useful to confer?"

Pope Pius warned that "such a claim of absolute, irresponsible power for the State leaves at the mercy of the same capricious despotism the stability of international relations, and the foundations of any lasting peace are shattered."

"No wonder then," he added, "that many right-minded men are anxious about the future, and the high hopes of many peoples begin to droop."

Above all, he stressed, it should be made "abundantly clear to them, and to national minorities, that they'll enjoy complete and genuine liberty in what is dearest to them—their cultural and religious life."

(RNS)

## Poland to Guarantee Religious Freedom

A series of laws guaranteeing religious freedom to all sects in Poland is being prepared by the new Polish government, it has been announced by Minister of Justice Henryk Swiatkowski, who has been placed in charge of church affairs.

"Poland is basically a Roman Catholic country, and the government is of the opinion that, first of all, full rights must be accorded to the Roman Catholic Church, but this must not be to the detriment of other denominations," Swiatkowski said. "The present government is trying to eliminate past errors which aimed at damaging and impeding the activities of the smaller denominations and will guarantee full freedom of conscience and belief to all."

(RNS)

## Dr. Cavert to Go to Geneva

By action of the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches, meeting on June 26, Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, General Secretary of the Council, has been released for six months' service with the Provisional Committee for the World Council of Churches in Geneva, Switzerland, for the purpose of assisting on major matters of organization and policy during the crucial period of reconstruction in Europe.

Authorization of Dr. Cavert's release by the Executive Committee was made in response to an official request presented by the three representatives of the Provisional Committee for the World Council during their recent visit to this country. Dr. Cavert will leave for Geneva in September.

## Authors in This Issue

*Dr. George P. Fedotov was professor of History in the Universities of Petrograd and Saratov. He left Russia in 1925 and taught Church History at the Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris until the German invasion in 1940.*

*We should like to remind our readers that we omit two issues of our journal during the summer months. The next issue will appear September 17, 1945.*

Periodical Division  
Detroit Public Library  
5201 Woodward Ave.  
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-46